

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-14 are amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 14 were objected to; Claims 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; Claims 1, 2, and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Shigeru et al. (Japanese Patent JP2002-006389, herein “Shigeru”); Claims 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Shigeru; Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Shigeru in view of Maitani et al. (U.S. Patent 4,273,434, herein “Maitani”); Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Shigeru in view of Yamaguchi et al. (U.S. Patent 4,847,648, herein “Yamaguchi”); Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Shigeru in view of Akira (Japanese Patent 02-201340); Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Shigeru in view of Oliver et al. (Japanese Patent No. 03-067322, herein “Oliver”); and Claims 3, 4, and 6 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. However, in view of the amendment to independent Claim 1, dependent Claims 3, 4, and 6 are maintained in dependent form.

In view of the objection to the claims and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Claims 1 and 12-14 have been amended as suggested by the outstanding Office Action. In addition, Claims 1-14 have been amended to better conform to U.S. claim drafting practice. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this objection and rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejections on the merits of the claims, independent Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite that an attachment section together with a lens barrel housing section are configured to partially expose a case of a camera. The claim amendment finds support in Figure 1 and its corresponding description in the specification. No new matter has been added.

Briefly recapitulating, amended Claim 1 is directed to a lens adapter to be mounted on a camera. The lens adapter includes an attachment section and a lens barrel housing section. The attachment section is configured to be mounted on the case in a detachable manner and the lens barrel housing section is provided at the attachment section and configured to house a lens barrel of the case. The attachment section together with the lens barrel housing section are configured to partially expose the case of the camera.

In a non-limiting example, Figure 1 shows that the attachment section 42 and the lens barrel housing section 48 expose the right hand side of the camera 100 such that a user has easier access to switches 18, 28, 30, 32, etc.

Turning to the applied art, Shigeru discloses a camera cover that protects a camera such that no dust and water reaches the camera. In this regard, Shigeru shows in Figure 1 a camera covering 110 fully enclosing the camera 10. Further, Shigeru shows in Figure 3 that the camera covering 110 together with the lens protection unit 152 and filter 160 fully enclose camera 10 in order to waterproof and dustproof camera 10.

Therefore, Shigeru does not teach or suggest that the covering 110 together with the lens protection unit 152 partially expose camera 10 as required by amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 1 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Shigeru.

The remaining applied art has been considered but none of the references cures the above-noted deficiencies of Shigeru. Further, it is noted that one of ordinary skill in the art

would not modify the covering 110 and the lens protection unit 152 of Shigeru in order to partially expose camera 10 because the purpose of this structure in Shigeru is to protect camera 10 from dust and rain, and not to expose any part of the camera to these elements.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that modifying the structure of Shigeru to partially expose camera 10 would defeat the purpose of Shigeru, which was clearly stated throughout their disclosure as waterproofing and dust proofing camera 10.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 59,140

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 03/06)  
RFF/rac

I:\ATTY\RFF\259741US-AM.DOC